

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/766,775
Response Dated 5/10/05
Second Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 1/10/2005
Page 10 of 12

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application in which Claims 17-25 have been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1, 4, 15 and 16 have been amended in the foregoing amendment.

Dworkin and Rofrano Do Not Show or Suggest the Invention of Claims 1-16

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-5, 7, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,992,940 to Dworkin ("Dworkin") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,035,283 to Rofrano ("Rofrano"); rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dworkin in view of Rofrano, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,710 to Dey ("Dey"); and rejected Claims 8-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dworkin in view of Rofrano, and further in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 10-261016 ("JP'016"). These rejections are traversed for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 1

The electronic catalog aggregation apparatus of amended Claim 1 requires a processing unit configured to process electronic catalog data received from registered catalog providers through at least one network into a prescribed common format in order to facilitate conversion of the electronic catalog data into a format specified by a catalog request; an electronic catalog database configured to store the electronic catalog data as processed by the processing unit; an extraction and conversion unit configured to extract at least one of the electronic catalog data corresponding to a catalog request received from each registered catalog user, from the electronic catalog database, and convert the at least one extracted electronic catalog data into an electronic catalog in a format specified by the catalog request;

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/766,775
Response Dated 5/10/05
Second Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 1/10/2005
Page 11 of 12

and a delivery unit configured to deliver electronic catalogs as extracted and converted by the extraction and conversion unit to respective registered catalog users through a network.

Dworkin describes a system that stores catalogs in a database and displays search results in a default format, such as the one shown in Fig. 6. See Column 3, lines 64-66 and Column 6, lines 16-25. However, the results are always presented in a common default format. They are not presented in a user-specified format. Thus, Dworkin fails to describe converting catalog data into a format specified by a catalog request received from a registered catalog user, as required by Claim 1.

Rofrano describes an electronic catalog system which assists and guides customers to products that the customers are most likely to be interested in purchasing, by presenting hypothetical sales agent's questions and possible answers and by asking the customers to select one of the answers. See Column 3, lines 11-22. The system of Rofrano also presents results in a common default format, regardless of the user or the request. The results are not presented in a user-specified format. Thus, Rofrano also fails to describe converting the catalog data into a format specified by a catalog request received from a registered catalog user, as required by Claim 1.

Accordingly, amended Claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill by Dworkin and Rofrano at the time Applicants made the claimed invention. Thus, amended Claim 1 should be allowed.

Claims 15 and 16

Amended independent Claims 15 and 16 include recitations similar to that of Claim 1. The remarks made above in support of the patentability of amended Claim 1 are also applicable to distinguish amended Claims 15 and 16 from Dworkin and Rofrano. Accordingly, Claims 15 and 16 should also be allowed.

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/766,775
Response Dated 5/10/05
Second Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 1/10/2005
Page 12 of 12


Claims 2-14

Claims 2-14 depend directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1. The remarks made above in support of the patentability of independent Claim 1 are also applicable to distinguish the dependent claims from Dworkin and Rofrano. Accordingly, Claims 2-14 should also be allowed.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicants solicit a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555
Our Docket: 44471/252431